

## REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed June 22, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 8-10, 15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,387,130 (“Fedder et al) and rejected claims 4-7, 11-14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fedder et al in view of United States Patent No. 5,545,052 (“Hirai”) and United States Patent No. 5,588,864 (“Lin”).

Consideration of the following remarks under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully urged. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 8-10, 15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fedder et al. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because Fedder et al does not recite each and every element set forth in claims 1-3, 8-10, 15 and 18-20, Fedder et al does not anticipate the subject matter recited in those claims.

Independent claim 1 recites an electrical connector wherein, *inter alia*, the latch including a first leg and a second leg which is substantially angled relative to the first leg such that a substantially “V” shape and the first leg being attached to the housing, the second leg having means for connecting the latch to a mating connector. Because the legs 82 and 86 of latch 80 in Fedder et al are angled relative to each other in a “U” shape, and because the means for connecting the latch of Fedder et al does not connect the latch to a mating connector, but rather, to a metal chassis 152 within which a receptacle connector 156A is located, Fedder et al cannot anticipate independent claim 1. As claims 2, 3, 8-10, 15, and 18-20 are ultimately dependent on claim 1, claims 2, 3, 8-10, 15, and 18-20 are likewise not anticipated by Fedder et al. As such, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3, 8-10, 15 and 18-20 as being anticipated by Fedder et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 4-7, 11-14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Fedder et al in view of Hirai and Lin. Claims 4-7, 11-14, 16 and 17 all ultimately depend upon claim 1, which the applicant has argued is not anticipated by Fedder et al for at least the reason stated above. Since neither Hirai nor Lin overcomes the shortcomings stated above, the combination of Fedder et al, Hirai and Lin does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 4-7, 11-14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Fedder et al in view of Hirai and Lin.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections in view of the above remarks, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conversation would facilitate the prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: August 22, 2005

By: Robert J. Zaitler  
Robert J. Zaitler  
Registration No. 37,973

Mailing Address:  
MOLEX INCORPORATED  
2222 Wellington Court  
Lisle, Illinois 60532  
Tel.: (630) 527-4884  
Fax.: (630) 416-4962